



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,628	11/20/2001	Kenji Yoshioka	21900/0039	2052
7590	02/05/2004		EXAMINER	
Morris Liss Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz PO Box 19088 Washington, DC 20036-3425			LINNENKAMP, NICHOLAS L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2635	jj

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/937,628	Applicant(s) YOSHIOKA ET AL.
	Examiner Nicholas L Linnenkamp	Art Unit 2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 November 2002.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2001 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_ .  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)      6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Specification***

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The applicant has used the term, "The present invention." It is understood that the abstract is about the invention. The applicant should remove the use of such terminology.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-2, and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okagaki et al. (heretofore Okagaki) in view of Hatcher further in view of Nagashima et al. (heretofore Nagashima).

In reference to claim 1, Okagaki teaches an emergency communication system (Fig 1), comprising:

- An emergency communication system terminal unit (**telephone unit 6, connected to security system 5**) installed on a vehicle (**unit designed for automotive use**)
- Emergency communication conveying means (**faceplate of radio 15**) serving as a communication device (**communicates wirelessly, Page 7, paragraph [0108]**) connected to said terminal unit so that a signal can be transmitted and received (**transmits and receives through infra-red radio frequency, Page 7, paragraph [0108]**),

Said emergency communication system transmits emergency information to a predetermined communication partner via said emergency communication conveying means.

- Means for detecting whether or not said emergency communication conveying means is connected to said emergency communication system terminal unit so that signal can be transmitted and received (**Absence of communication with the faceplate disables the radio and arms the security system, Page 7, paragraph [0106-0110]**)

Okagaki does teach that when the user detaches the faceplate of the car stereo that anti-theft system goes into effect discouraging theft of any of the system's components which includes the security control unit that monitors vehicle theft (**Page 7, paragraph [0106-0110]**).

Okagaki does not teach that the emergency communication system comprises:

- Means for prohibiting advancing movement of the vehicle when it is detected that the conveying means is not connected as the result of said detection

Hatcher suggests the use of a vehicle security system that immobilizes the vehicle to prevent theft (**Abstract**).

Nagashima suggests that a mobile phone be integrated with the faceplate of the radio so that the car stereo is rendered inoperable when removed and so that the faceplate of the stereo remains useful to the carrier (**Abstract**).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teaching of Okagaki with the suggestions of Hatcher because Okagaki teaches that the security control unit should detect attempted theft (**Col 6, paragraph [0111]**) and Hatcher suggests a way to avert theft through maintaining hydraulic brake actuation thus immobilizing the vehicle to unauthorized users. In addition, Hatcher suggests that this invention be used in a vehicle security system (**Abstract**).

It would have been obvious by one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Okagaki with the suggestions of Nagashima because Okagaki describes the use of a removable faceplate for the stereo and Nagashima suggests

incorporating a cellular phone with the faceplate. In addition, Nagashima suggests that the combination of mobile phone unit and stereo faceplate would help to remove the reluctance to take the faceplate with the vehicle operator due to the fact that the faceplate doubles as a phone (**Col 2, lines 15-39**).

Okagaki teaches that the security system should alert the user through the cellular telephone 6 that the security system has detected an abnormal event (**Page 16, paragraph [0258-0259]**). It would have been advantageous to place a mobile phone in the faceplate of the radio to reduce the number of devices the user has to carry and also provide a way for security system to report an abnormal event.

In reference to claim 2, claim 1 is taught as above. Nagashima teaches that the handy phone (**faceplate is also a telephone**) is used as the emergency communicating means and a telephone number specific to said handy phone is collated with a telephone number stored in advance (**A telephone number is an identification code**). **Nagashima teaches that an identification code assigned to faceplate/phone must be input for activation of the stereo containing the same identification code, Col 6 lines 11-24**), and if the two telephone numbers do not agree with each other operation of the starting system of the vehicle is disabled (**Nagashima teaches that when the identification code does not agree with the stored identification code, operation of the starting system of the vehicle is stopped according to the flow chart shown in FIG 4b, noted by decision boxes 113 and 120.**)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Okagaki, Hatcher and Nagashima with the suggestions of disabling the starting system of a vehicle because disabling starting systems such as ignitions and fuel injection systems are well known additions to vehicle security systems in order to deter theft of the vehicle.

In reference to claim 4, claim 1 is taught as above. Hatcher suggests the use of brake engager so that the brake cannot be disengaged when the security system of the vehicle is enabled (**Col 1, lines 6-14**).

In reference to claim 5, claim 1 is taught as above. When the faceplate is removed, the normal connection cannot be confirmed, thus enabling the security system. Okagaki teaches that a cell phone should attempt to contact an authorized user of the vehicle to alert them that an attempted theft might be taking place (**Page 1, paragraph [0014]**). Thus, there is provided a transmitting means (**cell phone 6**) for relaying information to an authorized user of the vehicle that it is not possible to confirm normal connection to the emergency conveying means (**the security system which is armed due to the absence of the faceplate, thus not being able to confirm normal connection to the faceplate, has entered alert mode**)

In reference to claim 6, claim 1 is taught as above. Okagaki teaches that an indicator is provided on a dashboard where instruments are installed, said indicator is used for transmitting that it is not possible to confirm normal connection of the

emergency conveying means (**Indicators such as the conspicuous absence of the faceplate/phone on the radio housing are given in the Okagaki and Nagashima patents. Also, non-normal connection of the faceplate would render the radio inoperable to the rest of the system, thus the indicators on the dash-mounted faceplate would not show proper connection to the rest of the equipment. In addition, it is well known in the art to use a blinking LED light, mounted on the dashboard, to indicate the activation of the security system. Normal operation of the faceplate/phone would deactivate the security system).**

In reference to claim 7, claim 1 is taught as above. When the faceplate is removed the normal connection cannot be confirmed, thus enabling the security system. Okagaki teaches that when security system detects an extraordinary event (**such as attempted theft**), the main unit is powered up, and the user is informed of the event through the functioning of the telephone system (**Page 1, paragraph [0014]**). It is an inherent property of the user, once notified of the event, to remember when such an event occurs or to record the event. In addition, cell phone records of the call would be maintained for billing purposes.

Thus Okagaki, Hatcher and Nagashima teach all the limitations of claims 1-2, and 4-7.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okagaki, Hatcher, and Nagashima further in view of Thibeault. Claim 1 is taught as above.

Thibeault suggests the use of a solenoid switch to disable the shift knob so that the shift knob cannot be shifted from park to drive.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Okagaki with the suggestions of Nagashima and Thibeault because Okagaki teaches that the security control unit should detect attempted theft (**Col 6, paragraph [0111]**) and Thibaeult suggests a way to avert theft through the use of a shift knob locking mechanism. In addition, Thibeault suggests that his invention be used with a security device such as an enabling/disabling encoder (**encoder shown as keypad 20, Col 6, lines 53-63**).

Thus, Okagaki, Hatcher, Nagashima, and Thibeault teach all the limitations of claim 3.

The examiner has included additional references from Greenwood et al. and Obradovich because they touch on relevant topics disclosed in applicants' specification. Greenwood discloses a system that automatically exchanges information upon collision with another object or vehicle. Obradovich discloses a system for effectively providing audio information in a vehicle along with providing many ways of providing that information to the user, such as LCD screens. It is also noted that applicants' invention overlaps many of the features found in similar emergency/information notice systems, such as ONSTAR developed and provided by General Motors Corp. in the mid-90's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas L Linnenkamp whose telephone number is (703) 305-8701. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on (703) 305-4704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Nicholas L Linnenkamp  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2635

NLL

MICHAEL HORABIK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

